

REMARKS

As best understood, the Office considers the *Kingsbury* message slots **80** (see *Kingsbury* FIG. 5) to correspond to Applicant's message slots **32**.

Applicant draws attention to the destination mask **52** associated with each of Applicant's message slots **32**. This destination mask **32** identifies the intended recipient(s) of the message. The step of identifying an intended recipient is achieved by selectively setting bits in the destination mask **52**.¹

In contrast, the *Kingsbury* message slot lacks a field that identifies an intended recipient. The *Kingsbury* message slot has only two fields: (1) a message field that contains the actual message, and (2) a size field that indicates the number of bytes in the message. Neither field contains information about an intended recipient of a message. Therefore, it is impossible to carry out claim 1's step of:

"modifying said new message slot to specify an intended recipient of said message"

This is because there is nothing *in the message slot itself* that can be modified to indicate the intended recipient of a message.

The *Kingsbury* system causes a message to reach its intended recipient by placing that message into the recipient's mailbox.² In *Kingsbury*, information identifying an intended recipient of a message is associated with the mailbox that the message is in. It is *not* associated with the message itself. Therefore, if one wished to send a message to several recipients, one would have to place a copy of the message into each of several mailboxes. This would make it necessary to create several copies of the same message, one for each mailbox.

¹ *Specification*, page 9, line 6 *et seq.*

² *Kingsbury*, paragraph 36 ("As described below, a sending process first translates the external address of the mailbox data structure to its internal address and then sends the message to the mailbox data structure at its internal address"); see also paragraph 44 ("The method of the Send_Message function places the messages into the mailbox data structure of the destination process...").

In contrast, in Applicant's system, information identifying intended recipients is associated with the message itself. Specifically, this information is in the destination mask **52**. Because the destination mask **52** specifies all intended recipients, a single copy of the message can be viewed by all the recipients.

As best understood on the basis of the remarks concerning claim 5, the Office considers the step of modifying a new message slot to be met when the resolver **44** inspects a table that lists the internal and external names of the mailbox.

Applicant points out that the resolver **44** does not actually modify any part of a message to indicate its intended recipient. The resolver **44** simply looks up the internal name of the intended recipient in a table and obtains the corresponding external name.³

It is apparent that *Kingsbury* fails to teach each limitation of the claim. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 102 rejection of claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon.

No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this response. However, to the extent fees are due, or if a refund is forthcoming, please adjust our deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket 07072-127001.

Respectfully submitted, .

Date: April 25 2005



Faustino A. Lichauco
Reg. No. 41,942

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906
21074103.doc

³ *Kingsbury*, paragraph 38 ("Before sending a message, however, the sending instance first translates the external name of the receiving instance's mailbox data structure into the internal name").